Tells the Facts and Names the Names

$2.50

CounterPunch

February 16-28, 2002 *Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair* VOL. 9, NO. 4

In This Issue

UNDER WHITE ROBES

- The Kind of Judges George Bush Likes
- The Racist Skeletons in Pickering's Closet
- Trent Lott's Secret History: Armed and Dangerous at Oxford, Mississippi

THE LORD'S AVENGER

- When Billy Graham Wanted to Kill One Million People

OUR LITTLE SECRETS

- A Holiday in Aruba? Best Go Elsewhere... Unless You're Sick
- Springfield, MO Wages War on the Poor
- The Sound of Freedom? USAF Heavy Metal Man Hailed by Sludgeaholics (and Sludgettes!)

From Bluster to Bombs:

Will The US Attack Iraq?

Saddam Hussein's regime is ordering small generators, which tells us that Saddam Hussein certainly reckons that a US attack may indeed be in the offing. When the bombing starts and the central generating stations get blown up all over again, there'll at least be some micro-generating capacity to keep a few lights on.

But just what is the likelihood of Bush cashing out his bluster about the Axis of Evil with an effort to finish off Saddam?

Start with the diplomatic chess board. Bush I put together a formidable coalition in 1990 after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. There's scant chance of Bush II matching that achievement. Among the European allies only the UK has signified support, and it will be harder to enlist France, let alone Germany. In 1990 Arab nations mustered to the coalition, led by Saudi Arabia, which trembled at the prospect that after Kuwait, it might be next. The likelihood that Saudi Arabia would endorse an attack today, let alone allow its territory to be the springboard for a ground assault on Iraq, is remote.

What other springboards are available? Kuwait, no. Syria, no. Iran, no. What other nation would assume the role that Pakistan has in the assault on the Taliban? The obvious candidate is Turkey, in profound economic crisis and in desperate need of US economic buttress. The US has a huge military base there.

The Kurds have been satisfied with the present situation, but no doubt would be offered appropriate cash incentives to support the invasion. Internally, the Shi'a learned the hard way in 1991 the dangers of relying on US pledges of support for a rising against Saddam. The Iraqi dictator has been making his usual stringent moves against the possibility of a coup, shifting generals constantly, deploying his party militia constantly on the streets to ensure that even the smallest demonstration will be instantly crushed.

Throughout the 1990s the CIA's attempts at destabilization of Saddam met with total failure, and there is no particular reason to believe that this has changed. There is no obvious replacement for Saddam, and the US's best known leader-in-waiting, Chalabi, lacks credibility.

But Saddam is an unpopular leader whose support is based on one section of Iraq's population, as was the Taliban's in Afghanistan. The US can pound Iraq again from the air. Armies desert if they feel defeat to be inevitable. New puppet leaders can be found and installed, as was Hamid Karzai.

In terms of domestic politics the opportune time for a US attack would be at the time of the mid-term elections in the fall, with the Congress up for grabs. The White House plainly feels it would win the battle for public opinion, with the flag waggers routing all dissidence in government except for the usual 30 or so holdouts among liberal Democrats and a handful of Republicans like Ron Paul. There have been a series of steady advances by the ultras whose aim is to wipe out Saddam.

There's also the issue of face. How long can the Bush regime threaten Saddam Hussein, without actually following through? Is the Bush regime blustering itself into war?

Some of those CounterPunch talks to, people with excellent experience of Iraq and of political currents in Washington,

(**Iraq** *continued on page 6)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Little Secrets

My Name Is Marc and I'm a Sludgeaholic

The US Air Force isn't above using rock'n roll to lure in new recruits.Their TV ads are saturated with powerchords and thunderous bass lines. As Dave Marsh recently pointed out in Rock and Rap Confidential, the Air Force has also used the services of The Who's Pete Townshend to advance its recruiting agenda.

But once you're inside the Air Force it's a different story. In addition to shaving heads, the Air Force is adamant that recruits not publicly display their admiration of heavy metal bands. A case in point. There's a website called MetalSludge.com, which is dedicated to what VH-1 likes to call "hair bands", or '80's metal. Poison, Dokken, Motley Crüe, Ozzy Osborne. You get the drift. Every month, a new heavy metal fan is voted in by the readers as the Sludgeaholic or Sludgette of the Month. The lucky winner's name and picture is put up on the site so that their devotion to hardcore rock 'n roll can be properly honored by metalheads far and wide.

The January 2002 Sludgeaholic Of The Month was Marc Strini, an Air Force grunt and heavy metal fanatic. We'll let the editors of Metalsludge.com tell the story from here: "Some other bitch in the Air Force stumbled across Marc as our Sludgeaholic Of The Month and reported him to his higher ranking superiors. Marc was then told it was inappropriate to represent the military in such a manner, and they ordered him ask us to take it down.

"Now maybe it's us, but doesn't the Air Force have better things to do than worry about than who's our Sludgeaholic of the Month? Isn't there a war they should be fighting right now instead of worrying about Metal Sludge? How insane is that? We guess it's ok to check your stocks and send pornographic e-mails on your work computer, but if you get a little attention from a site that makes you smile and laugh every time you browse through it, you are a bad apple! Don't you just love hypocrites?

"The moral of the story is it's ok to believe in what you want to believe in.....until someone disagrees with you. Whoever the jealous bitch was that reported Marc needs to take a look at themselves a little closer in the mirror and see they both wear the same outfits to work. We thank Marc for being a dedicated Sludgeaholic. We also want to say the views expressed in this post are that of Metal Sludge and Metal Sludge only!"

Editors
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

Business
Becky Grant (Manager)
Anna Amezcua

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions/supporters
$30 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683 (phone)
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org

Springfield's War

CounterPuncher Bill Glahn is a leader of the Copyright Anarchists (or CopyLeft, as he calls the new movement) and a chief organizer of a protest against the corporate music industry and its chief flack, Hilary Rosen, slated for the South-by-Southwest music conference later this month. Here's a dispatch from Glahn on the state of play in Springfield, Missouri:

In the closest major city to where I live, Springfield, MO, plans have been announced to build a $20 million ball park to house a new minor league team by March 2004, most likely a St.Louis Cardinals affiliate. The city has donated the land, with $10 million coming from the Springfield business community and state funding, $5 million from Drury College, and the final $5 million from additional city funding (more taxes). All this in a city that has outlawed soup kitchens.

Several downtown community outreach programs have come under attack from the city council recently. It claims that they are violating the city's soup kitchen policy by feeding the homeless who stay at overnight shelters and churches. The city has been trying for years to develop its impoverished downtown area into a tourist showcase, but first they have to get rid of those "pesky" poor people. Springfield is a quickly growing metropolis located in South Central Missouri, now Missouri's third largest city after St. Louis (eastern border) and Kansas City (western border). It's 30 minutes north of Branson (referred to as "Little Nashville"), a community whose #1 industry is tourism.

The Springfield city council has visions of cashing in on those same tourist dollars as you must pass through Springfield to get to Branson. A huge wildlife museum (stuffed animals, a collaboration between the city, the Chamber of Commerce, and the grandaddy of all hunting and fishing gear manufacturers, Bass Pro Shops) has already been built on the west side of town, forcing the working class poor even further outside of the city proper. The same situation has occurred in Northwest Arkansas in the past, where Walmart expansionism and low wages forced working poor from Bentonville, AR into impoverished McDonald County in southwestern MO. The results have been tragic, and just two weeks ago a fire killed 7 members of a 13-member family living in a 720 square foot trailer in McDonald County. The fire occurred when a stove was used to heat a pot of water overnight to provide heat in the trailer. But if the city council has learned a lesson from this, it is apparently "If we can't move them out, maybe we can burn them out". A recently proposed Livable Wage Referendum for the city of Springfield is meeting with strong opposition from the business community and the majority of members of the city council. The referendum would place the minimum wage for any company doing business with the city at $7.65 per hour, still well below poverty levels for a family of three.

Billy Graham: His Lust for Mass Murder

We're piqued at the contrast in press coverage of Billy Graham's conversations with Nixon, as displayed on the tapes gradually released from the National Archive or disclosed from Nixon's papers. Back in April, l989 a Graham memo to Nixon was made public. It was dated April 15, 1969,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and was drafted after the evangelist met in Bangkok with missionaries from Vietnam. These men of God said that if peace talks in Paris were to fail, Nixon should step up the warr and bomb the dikes which Graham wrote "could overnight destroy the economy of North Vietnam". Graham lent his imprimatur to this recommendation.

Thus Graham was advocating a policy to the US Commander in Chief that on Nixon's own estimate would have killed a million people. The German general Seyss-Inquart was sentenced to death at Nuremberg for breaching dikes in Holland in World War Two. (His execution did not deter the USAF from destroying the Toksan dam in North Korea, in 1953, thus deliberately wrecking the system that irrigated 75 per cent of North Korea's rice farms.)

This disclosure of Graham as an aspirant war criminal didn't excite any commotion. We recall finding a small story in the Syracuse Herald-Journal. No one thought to chide Graham or even question him about it. Very different has been the reception of a new tape revealing Graham, Nixon and Haldeman palavering about Jewish domination of the media.

Within days Graham was hauled from his sick bed, and impelled to express public contrition. "Experts" on Graham were duly cited as expressing their "shock" at Graham's White House table talk. Why the shock? Don't they know that this sort of stuff is consonant with the standard conversational bill of fare at most of the country clubs in America, not to mention many a Baptist soiree. Nixon thought American Jews were lefty peaceniks who dominated the Democratic Party and were behind the attacks on him. Graham reckoned it was Hollywood Jews who had sunk the nation in porn. Haldeman agreed with both of them. At whatever level of fantasy, they were all acknowledging power. But they didn't say they wanted to kill a million Jews.

That's what Graham said about the Vietnamese and no one raised a bleat.

ARUBANIZATION

The foul DynCorp, a major Pentagon contractor, was the subject of a recent CounterPunch report, not only anent charges about its employees' exploitation of sex slaves in Bosnia, but its fulfilment of a DoD construction bid on the island of Aruba, which is in the Lesser Antilles, just off the northern tip of Venezuela. Now Dave Patten, a CounterPuncher in Taunton, Mass, sends us this desolating report on Aruba's condition:

I returned from vacation to find the January 16 issue of CounterPunch in my mail. The article on DynCorp and Venezuela was interesting because my trip was to Aruba, where a relation has a timeshare. As that tiny place joins others in the crosshairs of multinationals and the Drug War, let me add my recent impressions to the article.

My only previous visit to Aruba was in 2000, where the slow pace and friendly nature were a welcome change from Massachusetts in mid-winter. I found the vacationers' demographics to be older than my 30 years, but not stodgy (though very white, of course). The pastimes, other than enjoying the beach, were gambling, shopping, and eating out; not unusual for a vacation spot but for me they rapidly wore thin. It was an enjoyable, if mildly boring, week.

Returning after only 24 months, I found many changes which served to remind me that the marketplace takes no prisoners. Aruba has rapidly changed into a poor imitation of American suburbia, with commercial development and its side effects apparently out of control. The unmistakable signs of this pattern, when overlaid on a modest but decent Third World environment, were appalling. Among the evidence: plastic shopping bags scattered across the landscape, even far from town, where cacti or aloe vera plants held them in place; automobile congestion, including muscle cars and SUVs, choking the streets. Away from Oranjestaad, in some formerly-interesting desert scrub, a large parking lot was being paved. In my wandering, I counted five car dealerships. (The island is only 12 miles long.) By the main road into O'staad, advertising was projected onto oil storage tanks after dark. There were many feral cats and dogs, which I suspect did away with the iguanas and geckos which once roamed by the resort. This especially hurt, on both counts; a downtown shopping area-cum-ghetto, once clean and bright, now overdone and tawdry.

The sullen faces of the employees were something from everyday America, or some company town. All the ATM's are now enclosed. There are piles of construction detritus, rebar, scrap wood, concrete blocks, and trash, dropped all over the place, nowhere near construction sites; new anti-crime devices on the buildings; large mesh screening inside windows and roll-down grating where there previously were none; a plague of rent-a-cops all over the island; several drug merchants downtown after hours. Instead of the few I saw selling only pot a few years ago, there were many, and you could have your drug of choice: ecstasy, 8-balls of coke, smack, weed.

Having reluctantly tuned into these changes, I followed through by asking a local about the Dutch marine garrison. He told me a tale similar to that of US marines on Okinawa; unaccountable mayhem to various degrees, including a child who lost part of his leg to an antipersonnel mine left on a practice field. He also spoke of a few instances of handgun violence, formerly unknown on the island. One involved a local cop who went unpunished while the true story about the event was silenced in the media.

Living most of my life in Massachusetts, I've seen Cape Cod go from a working class weekend spot to a wealthy strip mall nightmare, so the pattern I saw is familiar. Of the things I planned to do in Aruba, discovering the ways that the place is going downhill wasn't one of them. It was a crushing letdown from an attempt at a brief escape from the madness of the empire. Coming out of the general store at the resort, Dumbya was on a big screen TV, explaining his advisers' "alternative" to the Kyoto treaty. The screen crawler on Fox News should read THERE IS NO ESCAPE....THERE IS NO ESCAPE.

There are obvious disclaimers to make about this account, but I'll spare you and instead close with a bright spot about the island. I understand that the hospital in Aruba is still free to residents and visitors. How long that continues is unknown.

Thank you, Dave. We should also note that DynCorp carried the DoD contract for spraying chunks of Colombia in the cause of the War on Drugs, thus inflicting poison on the peasants and their food crops, as well as degrading the ecosystem.

Billy Graham urged Nixon to blow up the dikes and kill a million Vietnamese and no one raised a bleat.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Under the White Robe

Pickering and Lott's Racist Pasts

It's possible that by the time you read this, Bush's nominee to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, Charles Pickering, will have been rejected by the US Senate. Then for months to come we'll hear Republican howls about Democratic "partisanship" and similar nonsense. But even though his nomination may be history, it's worth learning just how much of an appalling racist and probable perjurer Pickering is, a man worthy of his prime backer in the US Senate, fellow Mississippian, Trent Lott, current Republican minority leader.

Pickering hails from Laurel, Mississippi. He attended the University of Mississippi with Lott, and served in the all-white Mississippi state senate from 1972 through 1980, where he and Lott became political buddies. He also served as chair of the Mississippi Republican Party during the late 1970s.

After making a nice living in private practice defending corporate polluters and tobacco companies, in 1990 Lott convinced George Bush I to nominate Pickering to the federal bench in the Southern District of Mississippi. Now Lott has convinced George Bush the Second to elevate Pickering to the Fifth Circuit Court, the most reactionary court in the federal system.

Pickering's appalling ideas on race, state's rights, women, and workers are largely an open book. And there's quite a paper trail, starting with a 1960 law review article for the University of Mississippi Law School. In a piece titled "Criminal Law Miscegenation/Incest" Pickering lamented that Mississippi's law criminalizing marriages between blacks and whites wasn't being enforced strictly enough. He took it upon himself to draft a plan to beef up the statute and toughen the sanctions for sex between blacks and whites. Two months after the article appeared in print, the Mississippi legislature turned the Pickering plan into law.

As a legislator, Pickering demonstrated an unremitting hostility for even the most cautious steps toward giving blacks any kind of foothold in the state's political system. In a senate floor speech in 1975, Pickering denounced the Voting Rights Act as an attack on state sovereignty. He backed reapportionment plans that deliberately submerged black voter strongholds into white dominated districts. And he supported an "open primary" plan for the state, which the Department of Justice said was unconstitutional and the three black members of the Mississippi House of Representatives characterized as an attempt by old-line racists to keep black candidates from winning general elections.

Pickering has long denied any association with the vile Mississippi's Sovereignty Commission, a kind of secret police force which worked to keep Mississippi segregated in the wake of the Brown v. Board of Education ruling. The Sovereignty Commission, often employing KKK thugs, spied on civil rights organizers, politicians, preachers and rockers (including Elvis Presley, B.B. King, James Brown and the Stones). They acted like a racist COINTELPRO operation, paying their snitches $100 to $150 for information, infiltrating civil rights groups, and deploying a robust arsenal of dirty tricks and smear tactics. The Commission also helped to cover up attacks on blacks and civil rights workers by the KKK and other vigilantes.

Pickering lamented that the Mississippi's law criminalizing marriages between blacks and whites wasn't being enforced strictly enough.

It's scarcely surprising that Pickering would want to maintain a healthy bit of distance between himself and this state-sanctioned goon squad. But he may have been so anxious to hide from his past that he perjured himself. In his 1990 testimony before the Senate judiciary committee, Pickering emphatically denied any association with the Sovereignty Commission.

"I never had any contact with that agency and I had disagreement with the purposes and the methods and some of the approaches that they took…Let me further point out that the Commission had, in effect, been abolished for a number of years. During the entire time that I was in the senate, I do not recall really that commission doing anything."

He was being disingenuous on nearly every point. Far from being mothballed, the Commission was regularly coming to the legislature for funds and Pickering was only too happy to oblige, voting to appropriate money for the segregationist snoops in both 1972 and 1973. The governor of Mississippi vetoed state funding for the Commission in 1973, but the plug wasn't officially pulled on it until 1977.

Back in 1990, Pickering may have felt secure that his secret ties to the Sovereignty Commission would never see the light of day. After all, as a senator he had twice voted to keep the records of the Commission sealed from public inspection until 2027. But in 1998, after protracted litigation, the ACLU won a lawsuit opening what remained of the files (much had been lost or destroyed) for public review.

Late last year a review of the Commission's files turned up an astounding memo written by one of the Commission's investigators detailing a request made by Pickering in 1972, while he was a senator, for the snoops to develop a dossier on a union that had launched a strike against the largest employer in Laurel, Mississippi, Pickering's hometown. He had also asked the Commission to pass along to him background information on the strike's leading organizer.

In light of these documents, Pickering's denials amount to willful distortions if not to perjury.

The wonder is that Pickering's lifelong association with racists and his own ante-bellum views on blacks and civil rights were not thrown back in his face

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in 1990 when Pickering appeared before the senate to lobby for his seat on the federal bench. At the time, the Democrats controlled the senate and mighty Joe Biden (and Ted Kennedy) ruled the Judiciary Committee. They let Pickering slide through with barely a thought. Here we are presented once again with the noxious consequences of senate comity, wherein supposed champions of civil rights such as Biden and Kennedy simply defer to the wishes of the likes of Trent Lott in exchange for similar deference when it comes to their own personal picks for federal judgeships. Apparently, it doesn't matter if another full-blown racist dons federal robes in southern Mississippi.

But Pickering has done plenty of damage since he ascended to the federal bench, where his evident animus toward blacks has surfaced again and again in his rulings and opinions. In a case called Fairley v. Forrest County, Pickering lashed out against the one-man/one-vote doctrine as "obtrusive". In another case, Citizens Right to Vote v. Morgan, Pickering characterized the Voting Rights Act as "an unnecessary intrusion" of federal authority into matters that the states are "perfectly capable of resolving." This is perverse legal reasoning to say the least, since the federal role that Pickering is carping about was initiated only after Mississippi's voting procedures had been ruled repeatedly to be racist and unconstitutional.

Pickering has proved to be equally harsh in his rulings in cases involving minorities suits over employment discrimination. Indeed, Pickering has displayed ceaseless animus toward the very idea of such claims. In a case known as Seeley v. City of Hattiesburg, Pickering set forth an argument that might even make Antonin Scalia cringe. In dismissing a claim brought by a black worker, Pickering wrote that "the federal courts must never become safe havens for employees who are in a class protected from discrimination, but who in fact are employees who are derelict in their duties."

The judge was even more frank in rejecting a case involving credit discrimination. "This case demonstrates one of the side effects resulting from anti-discrimination laws and racial polarization. When an adverse action is taken affecting one covered by such laws, there is a tendency on the part of the person affected to spontaneously react that discrimination caused the action. All of us have difficulty accepting the fact that we sometimes create our own problems."

Even a cursory look at Pickering's rulings reveals a judge who is at war with the very notion of federal law and the very role of the court he seeks to join. Often Pickering can't restrain himself from injecting personal diatribes into his opinions that have little direct bearing on the case but reveal the true nature of his reactionary legal agenda. Take the bizarre case of Randolf v. Cervantes. In this case, a paranoid-schizophrenic had been civilly committed to a state-run hospital. The deranged woman somehow found a hypodermic needle in a trash can and ended up injecting insulin into her eye. The woman's mother sued the state and the hospital, charging that they had failed their court-ordered duty to provide quality care for her daughter. Pickering swiftly dismissed the suit and went on a tirade in his opinion against any judge who might rule that the state should be held accountable. He declared that such liberal judges were engaging in "judicial pyramiding" and "reaching conclusions that [are] ludicrous." He ended by saying that a judgement for the plaintiff would add to a list of "things that have caused some to question whether the law in many instances has lost touch with reality, reason and common sense."

Of course, Charles Pickering is hardly an aberration. The court to which he aspires is arguably the most reactionary the nation has seen in decades and he would certainly feel quite at home there. Of the 15 judges on the panel only one is black, despite the fact that the Fifth Circuit covers the most racially diverse circuit in the nation, with minorities accounting for 44 percent of the population.

Moreover, the career of Pickering's patron, Trent Lott, has followed a similarly dark trajectory. The scene is Oxford, Mississippi, September 1962. A federal court orders the University of Mississippi to open its doors to James Meredith, who would be the first known black student at the school. The university and the state government refuse and vow to physically prevent Meredith from enrolling in classes. Citizen militias and Klan types converge on the campus carrying weapons. Days of bloody rioting followed.

The Kennedy administration responds by sending in federal troops to clear the way, although in one of his more infamous acts Bobby Kennedy orders that the troops be pre-segregated before they enter the state. More than 4,000 black soldiers are pulled out of their normal troops. "The Kennedys approved the segregation to avoid the political embarrassment of having black troops with high-powered rifles patrolling the streets of America's most segregated state, " William Doyle writes in his excellent, though little noticed, book American Insurrection: the Battle of Oxford Mississippi.

On the night of October 1, this white federal strike force descends on the Sigma Nu fraternity house. Frat boys had been particularly outspoken in their desire to see the Oxford campus remain a whites-only school. Inside the Sigma Nu house, the troops seize a cache of weapons, including 21 shotguns, a .22 rifle, a .30 rifle and a .22 Colt pistol. The president of the fraternity is none other than Trent Lott.

Lott has never had to answer for his role in the Oxford riots and there's no evidence that he's had much of a change of heart. In 1992 Lott gave the keynote speech at the annual gathering of the neo-segregationist Council of Conservative Citizens. During his speech Lott praised the group for "standing for the right principles and the right philosophy". Lott's kind words were recorded in an article in the group's newsletter, The

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year individual, $40
($35 email only / $45 email/print)
One year institution/supporters $100
One year student/low income, $30
T-shirts, $17
Please send back issue(s)
_____ ($5/issue)

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order, or just dial 1-800-840-3683 and renew by credit card. Add $17.50 for foreign subscriptions. If you want CounterPunch emailed to you please supply your email address. Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch.**
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Citizen Informer, a name that suggests the old Sovereignty Commission may not have been disbanded so much as simply privatized.

The Citizens' Council hasn't gone away, just gone online at http://www.cofcc.org. Shortly after Dan Pearl was kidnapped and word began to spread that he might be dead, the CCC posted an editorial on its website which suggested that Pearl deserved his fate because he was a miscegenist (not to mention a Jew): "Death by Multiculturalism: Daniel Pearl, a Jewish Wall Street Journal reporter kidnapped last week by Muslim activists, is pictured here with his mixed-race wife, Marianne. Despite rumors of her husband's murder, Marianne remains committed to racial and ethnic amalgamation. 'All my life, all his life and our life together is just a big effort to try to create dialogue between civilization[s],' she said. 'Remember, Diversity is our Strength!'"

But it turns out that Lott is not Pickering's only political fixer. Under withering questioning at his confirmation hearing in February by Senator John Edwards, the North Carolina Democrat and former trial lawyer, Pickering admitted that in 1994 he tried to convince an old friend in the Clinton Justice Department to tell federal prosecutors to propose a more lenient sentence for a defendant in a federal trial he was overseeing.

Now Pickering is not known for being soft on crime. He regularly berates defendents and prisoners seeking new trials with quotes from the Bible on the punitive nature of Old Testament justice, routinely denies plaintiffs access to trial transcripts and their requests for DNA tests that might prove their innocence. In fact, Pickering has let it be known that he believes the habeas corpus doctrine applies only to the "truly innocent".

But in this case Pickering took an unwontedly merciful line. The government, using a standard formula under the US Sentencing Guidelines, wanted Daniel Swann to spend seven years in prison. Pickering thought the sentence was too harsh and that Swann should be released on supervised parole. The man's crime: he burned a cross in the front yard of a mixed-race couple in Mississippi.

The man Pickering had called was one of Janet Reno's top deputies, Frank Hunger, then head of the department's civil division. Hunger and Pickering were old friends from the days when Hunger was a Mississippi lawyer who specialized in defending corporations against civil actions and tort claims. Although Hunger's name popped up in a few stories here and there, his political genealogy was not discussed. Frank Hunger is the brother-in-law of Al Gore and has long been one of his closest political confidants. As they say down in Mouseland, outside Orlando, the South is a small, small world after all. CP

On some accounts it was Thatcher who pushed Bush I into war with Saddam. We doubt Blair has equivalent clout.

(**Iraq** *continued from page 1)*

feel that the US will indeed launch a military attack on Iraq later this year.

But one Friend of CounterPunch disagrees, arguing that the net effect of the ranting about the axis of evil has been to redemonize Saddam Hussein and to diminish pressure to lift the sanctions. "The embargo has been under constant assault, but now people will say, 'At least he's not carpet bombing Iraq.' Remember, the whole strategy has always been to sabotage Iraq as a major oil supplier. In 1990 it worked brlliantly, sucking Saddam in to invade Kuwait. They wanted a heightened state of tension, a pretext for an embargo. Then Bush broke loose from the whole plan and pushed it to war. They walked into Iraq, the road to Baghdad was clear and then they panicked again, realising, no Saddam, no embargo. It was the most mysterious end to a war we've ever had. US troops were under orders not to shoot at Iraqi divisions, not to disarm them, just to let them go. That came out in Seymour Hersh's piece about McCaffery's massacre."

So the US kept Saddam and the embargo in place.

On some accounts it was Margaret Thatcher who pushed Bush I into war in 1991. We doubt Tony Blair has equivalent clout, but Bush II could stampede himself, just as his old man did. The antiwar movement had better be ready. CP

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558

Attention Subscribers: the number that appears above your name on the mailing label refers to the ISSUE NUMBER AND YEAR of CounterPunch after which your subscription expires. For example,06 02 stands for the 6th issue of 2002, ie, March 16-31.

Trent Lott's Frathouse Arsenal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED